

## Lake Apshawa and Sylvan Lake HSPF Model Peer Reviewer Selection

### Public Teleconference

August 15, 2019

#### Stakeholder Comments and District Responses

---

##### Angel Martin:

1. *You stated that the team would be answering the peer review comments on the Web site. I also would recommend that a formal document be prepared after the completion of the peer review where all the major review comments are listed and responded in a formal document.*

##### District Response:

As discussed on the teleconference, our standard procedure is to create a formal peer review response document. See the Wekiva basin model review documents as an example:

<https://www.sjrwmd.com/minimumflowsandlevels/wekiva-basin/>

2. *I reiterate that I think it would be better/best to have two peer reviewers for each project. Maybe one the peer reviews could be less thorough and maybe just look at the general modeling approach. I know that there are budgetary considerations but I believe that a second review would be worth it in the long run. I certainly benefited from at least two peer reviews when I participated in some HSPF modeling studies in Illinois with the USGS. Some of the HSPF modeling studies that I participated in that I thought were going to be relative simple turned out to be complicated and vice versa.*

##### District Response:

The CFWI peer review process document, approved by the steering committee in 2012, states that “depending on budgetary constraints and specific MFLs or reservation attributes, three or more reviewers with expertise representing each major subject area relevant to the evaluations (e.g., biology, ecology, hydrology, modeling) may be selected.” Because of the high number of MFLs water bodies in the CFWI that each require peer review of surface water models, hydrologic assessment, environmental criteria and recommended MFLs, the cost of review requires that the district prioritize which systems will have one or more reviewers. This decision is based on system (and thus model) size and complexity. Because of budgetary constraints, the small size and relative simplicity of Lake Apshawa and Sylvan Lake, we have chosen to proceed with only a single peer reviewer for the HSPF model developed for each system. It is worth noting that there will be other peer reviewers for each system during latter phases of the peer review process, specifically to review the environmental criteria, recommended MFLs and hydrological analyses used to assess the recommended MFLs.